

93D CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 93-724

PROTECTING PRIVACY AND THE RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

MARCH 4, 1974.—Ordered be to printed

Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1688]

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to which was referred the bill S. 1688 to protect civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendments and recommends that the bill do pass.

S. 1688 is identical to S. 1438 as unanimously reported by the committee and unanimously approved by the Senate in the last Congress. The report on S. 1438 is therefore reprinted below as approved by the committee.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to prohibit indiscriminate executive branch requirements that employees and, in certain instances, applicants for Government employment disclose their race, religion, or national origin; attend Government-sponsored meetings and lectures or participate in outside activities unrelated to their employment; report on their outside activities or undertakings unrelated to their work; submit to questioning about their religion, personal relationships or sexual attitudes through interviews, psychological tests, or polygraphs; support political candidates or attend political meetings. The bill would make it illegal to coerce an employee to buy bonds or make charitable contributions. It prohibits officials from requiring him to disclose his own personal assets, liabilities, or expenditures, or those of any member of his family unless, in the case of certain specified employees, such items would tend to show a conflict of interest. It would provide a right to have a counsel or other person present, if the

employee wishes, at an interview which may lead to disciplinary proceedings. It would accord the right to a civil action in a Federal court for violation or threatened violation of the act, and it would establish a Board on Employees' Rights to receive and conduct hearings on complaints of violation of the act and to determine and administer remedies and penalties.

STATEMENT

The subcommittee has found a threefold need for this legislation. The first is the immediate need to establish a statutory basis for the preservation of certain rights and liberties of those who work for government now and those who will work for it in the future. The bill, therefore, not only remedies problems of today but looks to the future, in recognition of the almost certain enlargement of the scope of Federal activity and the continuing rise in the number of Americans employed by their Federal Government or serving it in some capacity.

Second, the bill meets the Federal Government's need to attract the best qualified employees and to retain them. As the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Robert Ramspeck, testified:

Today, the Federal Government affects the lives of every human being in the United States. Therefore, we need better people today, better qualified people, more dedicated people, in Federal service than we ever needed before. And we cannot get them if you are going to deal with them on the basis of suspicion, and delve into their private lives, because if there is anything the average American cherishes, it is his right of freedom of action, and his right to privacy. So I think this bill is hitting at an evil that has grown up, maybe not intended, but which is hurting the ability of the Federal Government to acquire the type of personnel that we must have in the career service.

Third is the growing need for the beneficial influence which such a statute would provide in view of the present impact of Federal policies, regulations and practices on those of State and local government and of private business and industry. An example of the interest demonstrated by governmental and private employers is the following comment by Allan J. Graham, secretary of the Civil Service Commission of the city of New York:

It is my opinion, based on over 25 years of former Government service, including some years in a fairly high managerial capacity, that your bill, if enacted into law, will be a major step to stem the tide of "Big Brotherism," which constitutes a very real threat to our American way of life.

In my present position as secretary of the Civil Service Commission of the city of New York, I have taken steps to propose the inclusion of several of the concepts of your bill into the rules and regulations of the city civil service commission.

Passage of the bill will signify congressional recognition of the threats to individual privacy posed by an advanced technology and by increasingly more complex organizations. Illustrating these trends is

the greatly expanded use of computers and governmental and private development of vast systems for the efficient gathering of information and for data storage and retrieval. While Government enjoys the benefit of these developments, there is at the same time an urgent need for defining the areas of individual liberty and privacy which should be exempt from the unwarranted intrusions facilitated by scientific techniques.

As Prof. Charles Reich of Yale Law School has stated, this bill "would be a significant step forward in defining the right of privacy today."

"One of the most important tasks which faces the Congress and State legislatures in the next decade is the protection of the citizen against invasion of privacy," states Prof. Stanley Anderson of the University of California, Santa Barbara. "No citizens," in his opinion, "are in more immediate danger of incursion into private affairs than Government employees. When enacted the bill will provide a bulwark of protection against such incursions."

The bill is based on several premises which the subcommittee investigation has proved valid for purposes of enacting this legislation. The first is that civil servants do not surrender the basic rights and liberties which are their due as citizens under the Constitution of the United States by their action in accepting Government employment. Chief among these constitutional protections is the first amendment, which protects the employee to privacy in his thoughts, beliefs and attitudes, to silence in his action and participation or his inaction and nonparticipation in community life and civic affairs. This principle is the essence of constitutional liberty in a free society.

The constitutional focus of the bill was emphasized by Senator Ervin in the following terms when he introduced S. 1035 on February 21, 1967:

If this bill is to have any meaning for those it affects, or serve as a precedent for those who seek guidance in these matters, its purpose must be phrased in constitutional terms. Otherwise its goals will be lost.

We must have as our point of reference the constitutional principles which guide every official act of our Federal Government. I believe that the Constitution, as it was drafted and as it has been implemented, embodies a view of the citizen as possessed of an inherent dignity and as enjoying certain basic liberties. Many current practices of Government affecting employees are unconstitutional; they violate not only the letter but the very spirit of the Constitution.

I introduced this bill originally because I believe that, to the extent it has permitted or authorized unwarranted invasion of employee privacy and unreasonable restrictions on their liberty, the Federal Government has neglected its constitutional duty where its own employees are concerned, and it has failed in its role as the model employer for the Nation.

Second, although it is a question of some dispute, I hold that Congress has a duty under the Constitution not only to consider the constitutionality of the laws it enacts, but to assure as far as possible that those in the executive branch

responsible for administering the laws adhere to constitutional standards in their programs, policies, and administrative techniques.

The committee believes that it is time for Congress to forsake its reluctance to tell the executive branch how to treat its employees. When so many American citizens are subject to unfair treatment, to being unreasonably coerced or required without warrant to surrender their liberty, their privacy, or their freedom to act or not to act, to reveal or not to reveal information about themselves and their private thoughts and actions, then Congress has a duty to call a statutory halt to such practices. It has a duty to remind the executive branch that even though it might have to expend a little more time and effort to obtain some favored policy goal, the techniques and tools must be reasonable and fair.

Each section of the bill is based on evidence from many hundreds of cases and complaints showing that generally in the Federal service, as in any similar organizational situation, a request from a superior is equivalent to a command. This evidence refutes the argument that an employee's response to a superior's request for information or action is a voluntary response, and that an employee "consents" to an invasion of his privacy or the curtailment of his liberty. Where his employment opportunities are at stake, where there is present the economic coercion to submit to questionable practices which are contrary to our constitutional values, then the presence of consent or voluntarism may be open to serious doubt. For this reason the bill makes it illegal for officials to "request" as well as to "require" an employee to submit to certain inquiries or practices or to take certain actions.

Each section of the bill reflects a balancing of the interests involved: The interest of the Government in attracting the best qualified individuals to its service; and its interest in pursuing laudable goals such as protecting the national security, promoting equal employment opportunities, assuring mental health, or conducting successful bond-selling campaigns. There is, however, also the interest of the individual in protection of his rights and liberties as a private citizen. When he becomes an employee of his Government, he has a right to expect that the policies and practices applicable to him will reflect the best values of his society.

The balance of interests achieved assures him this right. While it places no absolute prohibition on Government inquiries, the bill does assure that restrictions on his rights and liberties as a Government employee are reasonable ones.

As Senator Bible stated:

There is a line between what is Federal business and what is personal business, and Congress must draw that line. The right of privacy must be spelled out.

The weight of evidence, as Senator Fong has said: "points to the fact that the invasions of privacy under threats and coercion and economic intimidation are rampant in our Federal civil service system today. The degree of privacy in the lives of our civil servants is small enough as it is, and it is still shrinking with further advances in tech-

nical know-how. That these citizens are being forced by economic coercion to surrender this precious liberty in order to obtain and hold jobs is an invasion of privacy which should disturb every American. I, therefore, strongly believe that congressional action to protect our civil servants is long overdue."

The national president of the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees, Vincent Connery, told the Subcommittee of this proposal in the 89th Congress:

Senate bill 3779 is soundly conceived and perfectly timed. It appears on the legislative scene during a season of public employee unrest, and a period of rapidly accelerating demand among Federal employees for truly first-class citizenship. For the first time within my memory, at least, a proposed bill holds out the serious hope of attaining such a citizenship. S. 3779, therefore, amply deserves the fullest support of all employee organizations, both public and private, federation affiliated, and independent alike.

Similar statements endorsing the broad purpose of the bill were made by many others, including the following witnesses:

John F. Griner, national president, American Federation of Government Employees.

E. C. Hallbeck, national president, United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Jerome Keating, president, National Association of Letter Carriers.

Kenneth T. Lyons, national president, National Association of Government Employees.

John A. McCart, operations director, Government Employees Council of AFL-CIO.

Hon. Robert Ramspeck, former Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

Vincent Jay, executive vice president, Federal Professional Association.

Francis J. Spch, president, 14th District Department, American Federation of Government Employees.

Lawrence Speiser, director, Washington office, American Civil Liberties Union.

Nathan Wolkowir, national president, National Federation of Federal Employees.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Following is a chronological account of committee action on this legislation to date.

S. 1688 was preceded by S. 1438 of the 92d Congress, S. 782 of the 91st Congress, by S. 1035 of the 90th Congress, and by S. 3079 and S. 3703 of the 89th Congress.

Violations of rights covered by the bill as well as other areas of employee rights have been the subject of intensive hearings and investigation by the subcommittee for the last five Congresses.

In addition to investigation of individual cases, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has conducted annual surveys of agency policies on numerous aspects of Government personnel practices. In

1965, pursuant to Senate Resolution 43, hearings were conducted on due process and improper use of information acquired through psychological testing, psychiatric examinations, and security and personnel interviews.

In a letter to the Chief Executive on August 2, 1966, the subcommittee chairman stated:

For some time, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has received disturbing reports from responsible sources concerning violations of the rights of Federal employees. I have attempted to direct the attention of appropriate officials to these matters, and although replies have been uniformly courteous, the subcommittee has received no satisfaction whatsoever, or even any indication of awareness that any problem exists. The invasions of privacy have reached such alarming proportions and are assuming such varied forms that the matter demands your immediate and personal attention.

The misuse of privacy-invading personality tests for personnel purposes has already been the subject of hearings by the subcommittee. Other matters, such as improper and insulting questioning during background investigations and due process guarantees in denial of security clearances have also been the subject of study. Other employee complaints, fast becoming too numerous to catalog, concern such diverse matters as psychiatric interviews; lie detectors; race questionnaires; restrictions on communicating with Congress; pressure to support political parties yet restrictions on political activities; coercion to buy savings bonds; extensive limitations on outside activities yet administrative influence to participate in agency-approved functions; rules for writing, speaking and even thinking; and requirements to disclose personal information concerning finances, property and creditors of employees and members of their families.

After describing in detail the operation of two current programs to illustrate the problems, Senator Ervin commented:

Many of the practices now in extensive use have little or nothing to do with an individual's ability or his qualification to perform a job. The Civil Service Commission has established rules and examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants. Apparently, the Civil Service Commission and the agencies are failing in their assignment to operate a merit system for our Federal civil service.

It would seem in the interest of the administration to make an immediate review of these practices and questionnaires to determine whether the scope of the programs is not exceeding your original intent and whether the violations of employee rights are not more harmful to your long-range goals than the personnel shortcuts involved.

* * * * *

Following this letter and others addressed to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Secretaries of other departments,

legislation to protect employee rights was introduced in the Senate. This proposal, S. 3703 was introduced by the chairman on August 9, 1966, and referred to the Judiciary Committee. On August 25, 1966, the chairman received unanimous consent to a request to add the names of 33 cosponsors to the bill. On August 26, 1966, he introduced a bill similar to S. 3703, containing an amendment reducing the criminal penalties provided in section 2. This bill, S. 3779, was also referred to the Judiciary Committee, and both S. 3703 and S. 3779 were then referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Comments on the bill and on problems related to it were made by the chairman in the Senate on July 18, August 9, August 25, August 26, September 29, October 17 and 18, 1966, and on February 21, 1967.¹

Hearings on S. 3779 were conducted before the subcommittee on September 23, 29, 30, and October 3, 4, and 5, 1966. Reporting to the Senate on these hearings, the subcommittee chairman made the following statement:

The recent hearings on S. 3779 showed that every major employee organization and union, thousands of individual employees who have written Congress, law professors, the American Civil Liberties Union, and a number of bar associations agree on the need for statutory protections such as those in this measure.

We often find that as the saying goes "things are never as bad as we think they are," but in this case, the hearings show that privacy invasions are worse than we thought they were. Case after case of intimidation, of threats of loss of job or security clearance were brought to our attention in connection with bond sales, and Government charity drives.

Case after case was cited of privacy invasion and denial of due process in connection with the new financial disclosure requirements. A typical case is the attorney threatened with disciplinary action or loss of his job because he is both unable and unwilling to list all gifts, including Christmas presents from his family, which he had received in the past year. He felt this had nothing to do with his job. There was the supervisory engineer who was told by the personnel officer that he would have to take disciplinary action against the 25 professional employees in his division who resented being forced to disclose the creditors and financial interests of themselves and members of their families. Yet there are no procedures for appealing the decisions of supervisors and personnel officers who are acting under the Commission's directive. These are not isolated instances; rather, they represent a pattern of privacy invasion reported from almost every State.

The subcommittee was told that supervisors are ordered to supply names of employees who attend PTA meetings and engage in Great Books discussions. Under one department's regulations, employees are requested to participate in specific community activities promoting local and Federal anti-poverty, beautification, and equal employment programs; they are told to lobby in local city councils for fair housing

¹ See also, *Cong. Rec. Comments*.

ordinances, to go out and make speeches on any number of subjects, to supply flower and grass seed for beautification projects, and to paint other people's houses. When those regulations were brought to the subcommittee's attention several weeks ago, we were told that they were in draft form. Yet, we then discovered they had already been implemented and employees whose official duties had nothing to do with such programs were being informed that failure to participate would indicate an uncooperative attitude and would be reflected in their efficiency records.

The subcommittee hearings have produced ample evidence of the outright intimidation, arm twisting and more subtle forms of coercion which result when a superior is requested to obtain employee participation in a program. We have seen this in the operation of the bond sale campaign, the drives of charitable contributions, and the use of self-identification minority status questionnaires. We have seen it in the sanctioning of polygraphs, personality tests, and improper questioning of applicants for employment.

In view of some of the current practices reported by employee organizations and unions, it seems those who endorse these techniques for mind probing and thought control of employees have sworn hostility against the idea that every man has a right to be free of every form of tyranny over his mind; they forget that to be free a man must have the right to think foolish thoughts as well as wise ones. They forget that the first amendment implies the right to remain silent as well as the right to speak freely—the right to do nothing as well as the right to help implement lofty ideals.

It is not under this administration alone that there has been a failure to respect employee rights in a zeal to obtain certain goals. While some of the problems are new, others have been prevalent for many years with little or no administrative action taken to attempt to ameliorate them. Despite congressional concern, administrative officials have failed to discern patterns of practice in denial of rights. They seem to think that if they can belatedly remedy one case which is brought to the attention of the Congress, the public and the press, that this is enough—that the "heat" will subside. With glittering generalities, qualified until they mean nothing in substance, they have sought to throw Congress off the track in its pursuit of permanent corrective action. We have seen this in the case of personality testing, in the use of polygraphs, and all the practices which the bill would prohibit.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission informed the subcommittee that there is no need for a law to protect employee rights. He believes the answer is—

to permit executive branch management and executive branch employees as individuals and through their unions, to work together to resolve these issues as part of their normal discourse.

It is quite clear from the fearful tenor of the letters and telephone calls received by the subcommittee and Members of Congress that there is no discourse and is not likely to be any discourse on these matters between the Commission and employees. Furthermore, there are many who do not even fall within the Commission's jurisdiction. For them, there is no appeal but to Congress.

As for the argument that the discourse between the unions and the Commission will remedy the wrongs, the testimony of the union representatives adequately demolishes that dream.

The typical attitude of those responsible for personnel management is reflected in Mr. Macy's answer that there may be instances where policy is not adhered to, but "There is always someone who doesn't get the word." Corrective administration action, he says, is fully adequate to protect employee rights.

Administrative action is not sufficient. Furthermore, in the majority of complaints, the wrong actually stems from the stated policy of the agency or the Commission. How can these people be expected to judge objectively the reasonableness and constitutionality of their own policies? This is the role of Congress, and in my opinion, Congress has waited too long as it is to provide the guidance that is desperately needed in these matters.

S. 1035, 90th Congress

On the basis of the subcommittee hearings, agency reports, and the suggestions of many experts, the bill was amended to meet legitimate objections to the scope and language raised by administrative witnesses and to clarify the intent of its cosponsors that it does not apply to the proper exercise of management authority and supervisory discretion, or to matters now governed by statute.

This amended version of S. 3779 was introduced in the Senate by the chairman on February 21, 1967, as S. 1035 with 54 cosponsors. It was considered by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and unanimously reported with amendments by the Judiciary Committee on August 21, 1967. [S. Rept. No. 534, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.] The proposal was considered by the Senate on September 13, 1967, and approved, with floor amendments, by a 79 to 4 vote. After absentee approvals were recorded, the record showed a total of 90 Members supported passage of the bill. The amendments adopted on the Senate floor deleted a complete exemption which the committee bill provided for the Federal Bureau of Investigation; instead, it was provided that the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be accorded the same limited exemptions provided for the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency. A provision was added to allow the three Directors to delegate the power to make certain personal findings required by section 6 of the bill.

Committee amendments to S. 1035, 90th Congress

1. Amendment to section 1(a) page 2, line 13:

Provided further, That nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit inquiry concerning the national origin of any such employee when such inquiry is deemed necessary or advisable to determine suitability for assignment to activities or undertakings related to the national

security within the United States or to activities or undertakings of any nature outside the United States.

2. Amendment to section 1(b), page 2, line 25: strike "to" (technical amendment.)

3. Delete section 1(e), page 4, lines 1-4 (prohibitions on patronizing business establishments) and renumber following sections as sections 1(e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l), respectively.

4. Delete section 4, page 10, lines 12-23 (criminal penalties), and renumber following sections as sections 4 and 5, respectively.

5. Amendment to section 1(f), page 4, line 25:

Provided further, however, That nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit an officer of the department or agency from advising any civilian employee or applicant of a specific charge of sexual misconduct made against that person, and affording him an opportunity to refute the charge.

6. Amendments to section 1(f), page 4, at lines 17 and 19, change "psychiatrist" to "physician".

7. Amendment to section 1(k), page 7, at line 10, change (j) to (i).

8. Amendment to section 2(b), page 9, at line 6 and line 9, change "psychiatrist" to "physician".

9. Amendment to section 2(b), page 9, at line 15:

Provided further, however, That nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit an officer of the Civil Service Commission from advising any civilian employee or applicant of a specific charge of sexual misconduct made against that person, and affording him an opportunity to refute the charge.

10. Amendment to section 5, page 11, line 21, insert after the word "violation." the following:

The Attorney General shall defend all officers or persons sued under this section who acted pursuant to an order, regulation, or directive, or who, in his opinion, did not willfully violate the provisions of this Act.

11. Amendment to section 6(l), page 16, at line 24, strike "sign charges and specifications under section 830 (art. 30)" and insert in lieu thereof "convene general courts-martial under section 822 (art. 22)" (technical amendment).

12. Amendment to section 6(m), page 17, line 14, change subsection (j) to (k) (technical amendment).

13. Amendment, page 18, add new section 6:

Sec. 6. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prohibit an officer of the Central Intelligence Agency or of the National Security Agency from requesting any civilian employee or applicant to take a polygraph test or to take a psychological test designed to elicit from him information concerning his personal relationship with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs or practices, or concerning his attitude or

conduct with respect to sexual matters, or to provide a personal financial statement, if the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency or the Director of the National Security Agency makes a personal finding with regard to each individual to be so tested or examined that such test or information is required to protect the national security.

14. Amendment, page 18, add new section 8, and renumber following section as section 9:

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in sections 4 and 5 shall be construed to prevent establishment of department and agency grievance procedures to enforce this Act, but the existence of such procedures shall not preclude any applicant or employee from pursuing the remedies established by this Act or any other remedies provided by law: *Provided, however,* That if under the procedures established, the employee or applicant has obtained complete protection against threatened violations or complete redress for violations, such action may be pleaded in bar in the United States District Court or in proceedings before the Board on Employees' Rights: *Provided further, however,* That if an employee elects to seek a remedy under either section 4 or section 5, he waives his right to proceed by an independent action under the remaining section.

Comparison of S. 1035, 90th Congress, as introduced, and S. 3779, 89th Congress

As introduced, the revised bill, S. 1035, differed from S. 3779 of the 89th Congress in the following respects:

1. The section banning requirements to disclose race, religion, or national origin was amended to permit inquiry on citizenship where it is a statutory condition of employment.

2. The provision against coercion of employees to buy bonds or make charitable donations was amended to make it clear that it does not prohibit calling meetings or taking any action appropriate to afford the employee the opportunity voluntarily to invest or donate.

3. A new section providing for administrative remedies and penalties establishes a Board on Employees' Rights to receive and conduct hearings on complaints of violation of the act, and to determine and administer remedies and penalties. There is judicial review of the decision under the Administrative Procedure Act.

4. A specific exemption for the Federal Bureau of Investigation is included.

5. Exceptions to the prohibitions on privacy-invading questions by examination, interrogations, and psychological tests are provided upon psychiatric determination that the information is necessary in the diagnosis and treatment of mental illness in individual cases, and provided that it is not elicited pursuant to general practice or regulation governing the examination of employees or applicants on the basis of grade, job, or agency.

6. The section prohibiting requirements to disclose personal financial information contains technical amendments to assure that only

persons with final authority in certain areas may be subject to disclosure requirements.

7. For those employees excluded from the ban on disclosure requirements, a new section (j), provides that they may only be required to disclose items tending to show a conflict of interest.

8. Military supervisors of civilian employees are included within the prohibitions of the bill, and violation of the act is made a punishable offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

9. A new section 2 has been added to assure that the same prohibitions in section 1 on actions of department and agency officials with respect to employees in their departments and agencies apply alike to officers of the Civil Service Commission with respect to the employees and applicants with whom they deal.

10. Section (b) of S. 3779, relating to the calling or holding of meetings or lectures to indoctrinate employees, was deleted.

11. Sections (c), (d), and (e) of S. 3779—sections (b), (c), and (d) of S. 1035—containing prohibitions on requiring attendance at outside meetings, reports on personal activities and participation in outside activities, were amended to make it clear that they do not apply to the performance of official duties or to the development of skill, knowledge, and abilities which qualify the person for his duties or to participation in professional groups or associations.

12. The criminal penalties were reduced from a maximum of \$500 and 6 months' imprisonment to \$300 and 30 days.

13. Section (h) of S. 3779 prohibiting requirements to support candidates, programs, or policies of any political party was revised to prohibit requirements to support the nomination or election of persons or to attend meetings to promote or support activities or undertakings of any political party.

14. Other amendments of a technical nature.

S. 782, 91st Congress—Committee amendments

S. 782, as introduced by Senator Ervin with 54 cosponsors, was identical to S. 1035 of the 90th Congress as passed by the Senate. As amended in Committee, it was reported to the Senate on May 15, 1970, and passed by unanimous consent on May 19.

The Subcommittee met in executive session on July 22, 1969, to receive testimony from Richard Helms, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and other agency representatives. On the basis of this testimony and after a number of meetings of subcommittee members with officials of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the language contained in the committee amendments was drafted and meets with the approval of the Directors of those agencies.

Amendments

1. Amendment to section 1(a), page 2, line 15 insert after the word "origin" the words "or citizenship" and after the word "employee", the words "or person, or his forebears".

2. Amendment to section 1(k), page 8, line 5 after the word "requests", strike the period and insert the following:

: *Provided, however,* That a civilian employee of the United States serving in the Central Intelligence Agency, or the

National Security Agency may be accompanied only by a person of his choice who serves in the agency in which the employee serves or by counsel who has been approved by the agency for access to the information involved.

3. Amendment to section 6, page 18, lines 15 and 16 delete "or of the Federal Bureau of Investigation".

4. Amendment to section 6, page 18, line 25, and page 19, line 1 delete "or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or his designee".

5. On page 19, add a new section 7 as follows:

SEC. 7. No civilian employee of the United States serving in the Central Intelligence Agency or the National Security Agency, and no individual or organization acting in behalf of such employee, shall be permitted to invoke the provisions of sections 4 and 5 without first submitting a written complaint to the agency concerned about the threatened or actual violation of this Act and affording such agency 120 days from the date of such complaint to prevent the threatened violation or to redress the actual violation: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect any existing authority of the Director of Central Intelligence under 50 U.S.C. 403(c), and any authorities available to the National Security Agency under 50 U.S.C. 833 to terminate the employment of any employee.

6. On page 19, add a new section 8 as follows:

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any way the authority of the Directors of the Central Intelligence Agency or the National Security Agency to protect or withhold information pursuant to statute or executive order. The personal certification by the Director of the agency that disclosure of any information is inconsistent with the provision of any statute or executive order shall be conclusive and no such information shall be admissible in evidence in any interrogation under section 1(k) or in any civil action under section 4 or in any proceeding or civil action under section 5.

7. On page 19, add a new section 9 as follows:

SEC. 9. This act shall not be applicable to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

8. On page 19, at line 5, renumber "SEC. 7" as "SEC. 10" and at line 20, renumber "SEC. 8" as "SEC. 11".

S. 1438, 92d Congress

As introduced by Senator Ervin with 53 cosponsors, S. 1438 was identical to S. 782 of the 91st Congress as unanimously reported by the Committee and unanimously approved by the Senate. S. 1438 was approved by the Committee without amendment on December 6, 1971, passed by the Senate by unanimous consent on December 8, 1971, and was referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. There a majority of the full committee voted to table the bill.

On August 1, 1972, upon a motion by Senator Ervin, the Committee added the text of S. 1438 as Title II of the House-passed bill H.R. 12652, extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission and expanding its jurisdiction to include a study of the rights of women. On August 4, 1972, the Senate unanimously passed H.R. 12652 as amended. This marked the fourth time in six years that the Senate had approved the provisions of the employee privacy bill.

The House rejected the Senate amendment and requested a conference. The Senate conferees stood by the Senate amendment until it became apparent that it might jeopardize passage of the entire legislation. When the Senate passed the Civil Rights Commission authorization, it accepted the conference committee's decision to delete Title II from the bill.

QUESTIONS ON RACE, RELIGION, AND NATIONAL ORIGIN

Many complaints received by the subcommittee concerned official requests or requirements that employees disclose their race, religion, or ethnic or national origin. This information has been obtained from employees through the systematic use of questionnaires or oral inquiries by supervisors.

Chief concern has focused on a policy inaugurated by the Civil Service Commission in 1966, under which present employees and future employees would be asked to indicate on a questionnaire whether they were "American Indian," "oriental," "Negro," "Spanish-American" or "none of these." Approximately 1.7 million employees were told to complete the forms, while some agencies including some in the Department of Defense continued their former practice of acquiring such information through the "head count" method. Although the Civil Service Commission directive stated that disclosure of such information was voluntary, complaints show that employees and supervisors generally felt it to be mandatory. Administrative efforts to obtain compliance included in some instances harassment, threats, and intimidation. Complaints in different agencies showed that employees who did not comply received airmail letters at their homes with new forms; or their names were placed on administrative lists for "follow-up" procedures, and supervisors were advised to obtain the information from delinquent employees by a certain date.

In the view of John McCart, representing the Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO:

When the Civil Service Commission and the regulations note that participation by the employee will be voluntary, this removes some of the onus of the encroachment on an individual's privacy. But in an organizational operation of the size and complexity of the Federal Government, it is just impossible to guarantee that each individual's right to privacy and confidentiality will be observed.

In addition to that, there have been a large number of complaints from all kinds of Federal employees. In the interest of maintaining the rights of individual workers against the possibility of invading those rights, it would seem to us it would be better to abandon the present approach, because

there are other alternatives available for determining whether that program is being carried out.

The hearing record contains numerous examples of disruption of employee-management relations, and of employee dissatisfaction with such official inquiries. Many told the subcommittee that they refused to complete the questionnaires because the matter was none of the Government's business; others, because of their mixed parentage, felt unable to state the information.

Since 1963, the policy of the American Civil Liberties Union on the method of collecting information about race has favored the head count wherever possible. Although the policy is presently under review, the subcommittee finds merit in the statement that:

The collection and dissemination of information about race creates a conflict among several equally important civil liberties: the right of free speech and free inquiry, on the one hand, and the rights of privacy and of equality of treatment and of opportunity, on the other. The ACLU approves them all. But at this time in human history, when the principle of equality and nondiscrimination must be vigorously defended, it is necessary that the union oppose collection and dissemination of information regarding race, except only where rigorous justification is shown for such action. Where such collection and dissemination is shown to be justified, the gathering of information should be kept to the most limited form, wherever possible by use of the head count method, and the confidential nature of original records should be protected as far as possible.

Former Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert Ramspeck told the subcommittee:

To consider race, color, religion, and national origin in making appointments, in promotions and retention of Federal employees is, in my opinion, contrary to the merit system. There should be no discrimination for or against minority persons in Federal Government employment.

As the hearings and complaints have demonstrated, the most telling argument against the use of such a questionnaire, other than the constitutional issue, is the fact that it does not work. This is shown by the admission by many employees that they either did not complete the forms or that they gave inaccurate data.

Mr. Macy informed the subcommittee:

In the State of Hawaii the entire program was cut out because it had not been done there before, and it was inadvertently included in this one, and the feeling was that because of the racial composition there it would be exceedingly difficult to come up with any kind of identification along the lines of the card that we were distributing.

The Civil Service Commission on May 9 informed the subcommittee that it had "recently approved regulations which will end the use of voluntary self-identification of race as a means of obtaining minority

group statistics for the Federal work force." The Commission indicated its decision was based on the failure of the program to produce meaningful statistics. In its place the Commission will rely on supervisory reports based solely on observation, which would not be prohibited by the bill.

As Senator Fong stated :

It should be noted that the bill would not bar head counts of employee racial extraction for statistical purposes by supervisors. However, the Congress has authorized the merit system for the Federal service and the race, national origin or religion of the individual or his forebears should have nothing to do with his ability or qualifications to do a job.

Section 1(a) of the bill was included to assure that employees will not again be subjected to such unwarranted invasion of their privacy. It is designed to protect the merit system which Congress has authorized for the Federal service. Its passage will reaffirm the intent of Congress that a person's religion, race, and national or ethnic origin or that of his forebears have nothing to do with his ability or qualification to perform the requisite duties of a Federal position, or to qualify for a promotion.

By eliminating official authority to place the employee in a position in which he feels compelled to disclose this personal data, the bill will help to eliminate the basis for such complaints of invasion of privacy and discrimination as Congress has received for a number of years. It will protect Americans from the dilemma of the grandson of an American Indian who told the subcommittee that he had exercised his option and did not complete the minority status questionnaire. He did not know how to fill it out. Shortly thereafter he received a personal memorandum from his supervisor "requesting" him to complete a new questionnaire and "return it immediately." He wrote: "I personally feel that if I do not comply with this request (order), my job or any promotion which comes up could be in jeopardy."

The prohibitions in section 1(a) against official inquiries about religion, and in section 1(e) concerning religious beliefs and practices together constitute a bulwark to protect the individual's right to silence concerning his religious convictions and to refrain from an indication of his religious beliefs.

Referring to these two sections, Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union testified:

These provisions would help, we hope, eliminate a constantly recurring problem involving those new Government employees who prefer to affirm their allegiance rather than swearing to it. All Government employees must sign an appointment affidavit and take an oath or affirmation of office.

A problem arises not just when new employees enter Government employment but in all situations where the Government requires an oath, and there is an attempt made on the part of those who prefer to affirm. It is amazing the intransigence that arises on the part of clerks or those who require the filling out of these forms, or the giving of the statement in permitting individuals to affirm.

The excuses that are made vary tremendously, either that the form can only be signed and they cannot accept a form in which "so help me God" is struck out, because that is an amendment, and they are bound by their instructions which do not permit any changes to be made on the forms at all.

Also, in connection with the giving of oaths, I have had one case in which an investigator asked a young man this question: "For the purposes of administering the oath, do you believe in God?"

It is to be hoped that the provisions of this bill would bar practices of that kind. The law should be clear at this time. Title I, United States Code, section 1 has a number of rules of construction, one of which says that wherever the word "oath" appears, that includes "affirmation," and wherever the word "swear" appears, that includes "affirm."

This issue comes up sometimes when clerks will ask, "Why do you want to affirm? Do you belong to a religious group that requires an affirmation rather than taking an oath?" And unless the individual gives the right answer, the clerks won't let him affirm. It is clear under the *Torcaso* case that religious beliefs and lack of religious beliefs are equally entitled to the protection of the first amendment.

The objection has been raised that the prohibition against inquiries into race, religion, or national origin would hinder investigation of discrimination complaints. In effect, however, it is expected to aid rather than hinder in this area of the law, by decreasing the opportunities for discrimination initially. It does not hinder acquisition of the information elsewhere; nor does it prevent a person from volunteering the information if he wishes to supply it in filing a complaint or in the course of an investigation.

CONTROL OF EMPLOYEE OPINIONS, OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES

Reports have come to the subcommittee of infringements and threatened infringements on first amendment freedoms of employees: freedom to think for themselves free of Government indoctrination; freedom to choose their outside civic, social, and political activities as citizens free of official guidance; or even freedom to refuse to participate at all without reporting to supervisors.

Illustrative of the climate of surveillance the subcommittee has found was a 13-year-old Navy Department directive, reportedly similar to those in other agencies, warning employees to guard against "indirect remarks" and to seek "wise and mature" counsel within their agencies before joining civic or political associations.

In the view of the United Federation of Postal Clerks:

Perhaps no other right is so essential to employee morale as the right to personal freedom and the absence of interference by the Government in the private lives and activities of its employees. Attempts to place prohibitions on the private associations of employees; mandatory reporting of social contacts with Members of Congress and the press; attempts to "orient" or "indoctrinate" Federal employees on

subjects outside their immediate areas of professional interest; attempts to "encourage" participation in outside activities or discourage patronage of selected business establishments and coercive campaigns for charitable donations are among the most noteworthy abuses of Federal employees' right to personal freedom.

An example of improper on-the-job indoctrination of employees about sociological and political matters was cited in his testimony by John Griner, president of the AFL-CIO affiliated American Federation of Government Employees:

One instance of disregard of individual rights of employees as well as responsibility to the taxpayers, which has come to my attention, seems to illustrate the objectives of subsections (b), (c), and (d), of section 1 of the Ervin bill. It happened at a large field installation under the Department of Defense.

The office chief called meetings of different groups of employees throughout the day * * *. A recording was played while employees listened about 30 minutes. It was supposedly a speech made at a university, which went deeply into the importance of integration of the races in this country. There was discussion of the United Nations—what a great thing it was—and how there never could be another world war. The person who reported this incident made this comment: "Think of the taxpayers' money used that day to hear that record." I think that speaks for itself.

Other witnesses were in agreement with Mr. Griner's view on the need for protecting employees now and in the future from any form of indoctrination on issues unrelated to their work. The issue was defined at hearings on S. 3779 in the following colloquy between the subcommittee chairman and Mr. Griner.

If they are permitted to hold sessions such as this on Government time and at Government expense, they might then also hold sessions as to whether or not we should be involved in the Vietnam war or whether we should not be, whether we should pull out or whether we should stay, and I think it could go to any extreme under those conditions.

Of course, we are concerned with it, yes. But that is not a matter for the daily routine of work.

Senator ERVIN. Can you think of anything which has more direful implications for a free America than a practice by which a government would attempt to indoctrinate any man with respect to a particular view on any subject other than the proper performance of his work?

Mr. GRINER. I think if we attempted to do that we would be violating the individual's constitutional rights.

Senator ERVIN. Is there any reason whatever why a Federal civil service employee should not have the same right to have his freedom of thought on all things under the sun outside of the restricted sphere of the proper performance of his work that any other American enjoys?

Mr. GRINER. No, sir.

With one complaint of attempted indoctrination of employees at a Federal installation, a civil servant enclosed a memorandum taken from a bulletin board stating the time, place, and date of a lecture by a sociology professor on the subject of the importance of racial integration. Attendance was to be voluntary but the notice stated that a record would be made of those attending or not attending.

Concerning such a practice, one witness commented: "If I had been a Federal employee and I cared anything about my job, I would have been at that lecture."

Employees of an installation in Pennsylvania complained of requirements to attend film lectures on issues of the cold war.

Witnesses agreed that taking notice of attendance at such meetings constituted a form of coercion to attend. Section 1(b) will eliminate such intimidation. It leaves unaffected existing authority to use any appropriate means, including publicity, to provide employees information about meetings concerning matters such as charity drives and bond-selling campaigns.

Section (c) protests a basic constitutional right of the individual employee to be free of official pressure on him to engage in any civic or political activity or undertaking which might involve him as a private citizen, but which has no relation to his Federal employment. It preserves his freedom of thought and expression, including his right to keep silent, or to remain inactive.

This section will place a statutory bar against the recurrence of employee complaints such as the following received by a Member of the Senate:

Dear Senator ———: On ———, 1966, a group of Treasury Department administrators were called to Miami for a conference led by ———, Treasury Personnel Officer, with regard to new revisions in chapter 713 of the Treasury Personnel Manual.

Over the years the Treasury Department has placed special emphasis on the hiring of Negroes under the equal employment opportunity program, and considerable progress in that regard has been made. However, the emphasis of the present conference was that our efforts in the field of equal employment opportunity have not been sufficient. Under the leadership of President Johnson and based on his strong statement with regard to the need for direct action to cure the basic causes leading to discrimination, the Treasury Department has now issued specific instructions requiring all supervisors and line managers to become actively and aggressively involved in the total civil rights problem.

The requirements laid down by chapter 713 and its appendix include participation in such groups as the Urban League, NAACP, et cetera (these are named specifically) and involvement in the total community action program, including open housing, integration of schools, et cetera.

The policies laid down in this regulation, as verbally explained by the Treasury representatives at the conference, go far beyond any concept of employee personnel responsibility previously expressed. In essence, this regulation requires every Treasury manager or supervisor to become a

social worker, both during his official hours and on his own time. This was only tangentially referred to in the regulation and its appendages, but was brought out forcefully in verbal statements by Mr. ——— and ———. Frankly, this is tremendously disturbing to me and to many of the other persons with whom I have discussed the matter. We do not deny the need for strong action in the field of civil rights, but we do sincerely question the authority of our Government to lay out requirements to be met on our own time which are repugnant to our personal beliefs and desires.

The question was asked as to what disciplinary measures would be taken against individuals declining to participate in these community action programs. The reply was given by the equal employment officer, that such refusal would constitute an undesirable work attitude bordering on insubordination and should at the very least be reflected on the annual efficiency rating of the employee.

The principles expressed in these regulations and in this conference strike me as being of highly dangerous potential. If we, who have no connection with welfare or social programs, can be required to take time from our full-time responsibilities in our particular agencies and from the hours normally reserved for our own refreshment and recreation to work toward integration of white neighborhoods, integration of schools by artificial means, and to train Negroes who have not availed themselves of the public schooling available, then it would seem quite possible that under other leadership, we could be required to perform other actions which would actually be detrimental to the interests of our Nation.

* * * * *

Testifying on the issue of reporting outside activities, the American Civil Liberties Union representative commented:

To the extent that individuals are apprehensive they are going to have to, at some future time, tell the Government about what organizations they have belonged to or been associated with, that is going to inhibit them in their willingness to explore all kinds of ideas, their willingness to hear speakers, their willingness to do all kinds of things. That has almost as deadening an effect on free speech in a democracy as if the opportunities were actually cut off.

The feeling of inhibition which these kinds of questions cause is as dangerous, it seems to me, as if the Government were making actual edicts.

Witnesses gave other examples of invasion of employees' private lives which would be halted by passage of the bill.

In the southwest a division chief dispatched a buck slip to his group supervisors demanding: "the names * * * of employees * * * who are participating in any activities including such things as: PTA in integrated schools, sports activities which are inter-social, and such things as Great Books discussion groups which have integrated memberships."

* * * * *

In a Washington office of the Department of Defense, a branch chief by telephone asked supervisors to obtain from employees the names of any organizations they belonged to. The purpose apparently was to obtain invitations for Federal Government officials to speak before such organizations.

Reports have come to the subcommittee that the Federal Maritime Commission, pursuant to civil service regulations, requested employees to participate in community activities to improve the employability of minority groups, and to report to the chairman any outside activities.

In addition to such directives, many other instances involving this type of restriction have come to the attention of the subcommittee over a period of years. For example, some agencies have either prohibited flatly, or required employees to report, all contacts, social or otherwise, with Members of Congress or congressional staff members. In many cases reported to the subcommittee, officials have taken reprisals against employees who communicated with their Congressmen and have issued directives threatening such action.

The Civil Service Commission on its Form 85 for nonsensitive positions requires an individual to list: "Organizations with which affiliated (past and present) other than religious or political organizations or those with religious or political affiliations (if none, so state)."

PRIVACY INVASIONS IN INTERVIEWS, INTERROGATIONS, AND PERSONALITY TESTS

Although it does not outlaw all of the unwarranted personal prying to which employees and applicants are now subjected, section 1(e) of the reported bill will prohibit the more serious invasions of personal privacy reported. The subcommittee believes it will also result in limitations beyond its specific prohibitions by encouraging administrative adherence to the principles it reflects.

It will halt mass programs in which, as a general rule, agency officials conduct interviews during which they require or request applicants or employees to reveal intimate details about their habits, thoughts, and attitudes on matters unrelated to their qualifications and ability to perform a job.

It will also halt individual interrogations such as that involving an 18-year-old college sophomore applying for a summer job as a secretary at a Federal department.

In the course of an interview with a department investigator, she was asked wide-ranging personal questions. For instance, regarding a boy whom she was dating, she was asked questions which denoted assumptions made by the investigator, such as:

Did he abuse you?
Did he do anything unnatural with you? You didn't get pregnant, did you?

There's kissing, petting, and intercourse, and after that, did he force you to do anything to him, or did he do anything to you?

The parent of this student wrote:

This interview greatly transcended the bounds of normal areas and many probing personal questions were propounded. Most questions were leading and either a negative or positive answer resulted in an appearance of self-incrimination. During this experience, my husband was on an unaccompanied tour of duty in Korea and I attempted alone, without success, to do battle with the Department.

I called and was denied any opportunity to review what had been recorded in my daughter's file. Likewise my daughter was denied any review of the file in order to verify or refute any of the record made by the State Department interviewer. This entire matter was handled as if applicants for State Department employment must subject themselves to the personal and intimate questions and abdicate all claims to personal rights and privileges.

As a result of this improper intrusion into my daughter's privacy which caused all great mental anguish, I had her application for employment withdrawn from the State Department. This loss of income made her college education that much more difficult.

Upon my husband's return, we discussed this entire situation and felt rather than subjecting her again to the sanctioned methods of Government investigation we would have her work for private industry. This she did in the summer of 1966, with great success and without embarrassing or humiliating Gestapo-type investigation.

Upon subcommittee investigation of this case, the Department indicated that this was not a unique case, because it used a "uniform policy in handling the applications of summer employees as followed with all other applicant categories." It stated that its procedure under Executive Order 10450 is a basic one "used by the Department and other executive agencies concerning the processing of any category of applicants who will be dealing with sensitive, classified material." Its only other comment on the case was to assure that "any information developed during the course of any of our investigations that is of a medical nature, is referred to our Medical Division for proper evaluation and judgment." In response to a request for copies of departmental guidelines governing such investigations and interviews, the subcommittee was told they were classified.

Section 1(e) would protect every employee and every civilian who offers his services to his Government from indiscriminate and unauthorized requests to submit to any test designed to elicit such information as the following:

My sex life is satisfactory,
I have never been in trouble because of my sex behavior.
Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the
Bible said it would.

I loved my father.
I am very strongly attracted by members of my own sex.
I go to church almost every week.
I believe in the second coming of Christ.
I believe in a life hereafter.
I have never indulged in any unusual sex practices.
I am worried about sex matters.
I am very religious (more than most people).
I loved my mother.
I believe there is a Devil and a Hell in afterlife.
I believe there is a God.
Once in a while I feel hate toward members of my family
whom I usually love.
I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex.

The subcommittee hearings in 1965 on "Psychological tests and constitutional rights" and its subsequent investigations support the need for such statutory prohibitions on the use of tests.

In another case, the subcommittee was told, a woman was questioned for 6 hours "about every aspect of her sex life—real, imagined, and gossiped—with an intensity that could only have been the product of inordinately salacious minds."

The specific limitation on the three areas of questioning proscribed in S. 1035 in no way is intended as a grant of authority to continue or initiate the official eliciting of personal data from individuals on subjects not directly proscribed. It would prohibit investigators, or personnel, security and medical specialists from indiscriminately requiring or requesting the individual to supply, orally or through tests, data on religion, family, or sex. It does not prevent a physician from doing so if he has reason to believe the employee is "suffering from mental illness" and believes the information is necessary to make a diagnosis. Such a standard is stricter than the broad "fitness for duty" standard now generally applied by psychiatrists and physicians in the interviews and testing which an employee can be requested and required to undergo.

There is nothing in this section to prohibit an official from advising an individual of a specific charge of sexual misconduct and affording him an opportunity to refute the charge voluntarily.

POLYGRAPHING

Section 1(f) makes it unlawful for any officer of any executive department or agency or any person acting under his authority to require or request or attempt to require or request any civilian employee or any applicant for employment to take any polygraph test designed to elicit from him information concerning his personal relationship with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs, practices or concerning his attitude or conduct with respect to sexual matters. While this section does not eliminate the use of so-called lie detectors by Government, it assures that where such devices are used for these purposes it will be only in limited areas.

John McCart, representing the Government Employees Council of AFL-CIO, supported this section of the bill, citing a 1965 report by a special subcommittee of the AFL-CIO executive council that:

The use of lie detectors violates basic considerations of human dignity in that they involve the invasion of privacy, self-incrimination, and the concept of guilt until proven innocent.

Congressional investigation¹ has shown that there is no scientific validation for the effectiveness or accuracy of lie detectors. Yet despite this and the invasion of privacy involved, lie detectors are being used or may be used in various agencies of the Federal Government for purposes of screening applicants or for pursuing investigations.

This section of the bill is based on complaints such as the following received by the subcommittee:

When I graduated from college in 1965, I applied at NSA. I went to 2 days of testing, which apparently I passed because the interviewer seemed pleased and he told me that they could always find a place for someone with my type of degree.

About 1 month later, I reported for a polygraph test at an office on Wisconsin Avenue in the District or just over the District line in Maryland. I talked with the polygraph operator, a young man around 25 years of age. He explained how the machine worked, etc. He ran through some of the questions before he attached the wires to me. Some of the questions I can remember are—

“When was the first time you had sexual relations with a woman?”

“How many times have you had sexual intercourse?”

“Have you ever engaged in homosexual activities?”

“Have you ever engaged in sexual activities with an animal?”

“When was the first time you had intercourse with your wife?”

“Did you have intercourse with her before you were married? How many times?”

He also asked questions about my parents, Communist activities, etc. I remember that I thought this thing was pretty outrageous, but the operator assured me that he asked everybody the same questions and he has heard all the answers before, it just didn't mean a thing to him. I wondered how he could ever get away with asking a girl those kinds of questions.

When I was finished, I felt as though I had been in a 15 round championship boxing match. I felt exhausted. I made up my mind then and there that I wouldn't take the job even if they wanted me to take it. Also, I concluded that I would never again apply for a job with the Government, especially where they make you take one of these tests.

Commenting on this complaint, the subcommittee chairman observed:

¹ Hearings and reports on the use of polygraphs as “lie detectors” by the Federal Government before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, April 1964 through 1966.

Certainly such practices should not be tolerated even by agencies charged with security missions. Surely, the financial, scientific, and investigative resources of the Federal Government are sufficient to determine whether a person is a security risk, without strapping an applicant to a machine and subjecting him to salacious questioning. The Federal Bureau of Investigation does not use personality tests or polygraphs on applicants for employment. I fail to see why the National Security Agency finds them so fascinating.

COERCION TO BUY BONDS AND CONTRIBUTE TO CAUSES

The hearing record and subcommittee complaint files amply document the need for statutory protections against all forms of coercion of employees to buy bonds and contribute to causes. Involved here is the freedom of the individual to invest and donate his money as he sees fit, without official coercion. As the subcommittee chairman explained:

It certainly seems to me that each Federal employee, like any other citizen in the United States, is the best judge of his capacity, in the light of his financial obligations, to participate or decide whether he will participate and the extent of his participation in a bond drive. That is a basic determination which he and he alone should make.

I think there is an interference with fundamental rights when coercion of a psychological or economic nature is brought on a Federal employee, even to make him do right. I think a man has to have a choice of acting unwisely as well as wisely, if he is going to have any freedom at all.

The subcommittee has received from employees and their organizations numerous reports of intimidation, threats of loss of job, and security clearances and of denial of promotion for employees who do not participate to the extent supervisors wish. The hearing record contains examples of documented cases of reprisals, many of which have been investigated at the subcommittee's request and confirmed by the agency involved. It is apparent that policy statements and administrative rules are not sufficient to protect individuals from such coercion.

The president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks informed the subcommittee:

Section 1, paragraph (i) of S. 3779 is particularly important to all Federal employees and certainly to our postal clerks. The extreme arm-twisting coercion, and pressure tactics exerted by some postmasters on our members earlier this year during the savings bond drive must not be permitted at any future time in the Government service.

Our union received complaints from all over the country where low-paid postal clerks, most having the almost impossible problem of trying to support a family and exist on sub-standard wages, were practically being ordered to sign up for purchase of U.S. savings bonds, or else. The patriotism of our postal employees cannot be challenged. I recently was

advised that almost 75 percent of postal workers are veterans of the Armed Forces and have proven their loyalty and patriotism to this great country of ours on the battlefield in many wars. Yet, some postmasters questioned this patriotism and loyalty if any employee could not afford to purchase a savings bond during the drive.

The president of the National Association of Government Employees testified:

We are aware of instances wherein employees were told that if they failed to participate in the bond program they would be frozen in their position without promotional opportunities.

In another agency the names of individuals who did not participate were posted for all to see. We have been made aware of this situation for some years and we know that Congress has been advised of the many instances and injustices Federal employees faced concerning their refusal or inability to purchase bonds.

Certainly, the Government, which has thousands of public relations men in its agencies and departments, should be capable of promoting a bond program that does not include the sledge-hammer approach.

Some concern has been expressed by officials of the United Community Funds and Councils of America, the American Heart Association, Inc., and other charitable organizations, that the bill would hamper their campaigns in Federal agencies.

For this reason, the bill contains a proviso to express the intent of the sponsors that officials may still schedule meetings and take any appropriate action to publicize campaigns and to afford employees the opportunity to invest or donate their money voluntarily. It is felt that this section leaves a wide scope for reasonable action in promoting bond selling and charity drives.

The bill will prohibit such practices as were reported to the subcommittee in the following complaints:

We have not yet sold our former home and cannot afford to buy bonds while we have both mortgage payments and rental payments to meet. Yet I have been forced to buy bonds, as I was told the policy at this base is, "Buy bonds or by-by."

In short, after moving 1,700 miles for the good of the Government, I was told I would be fired if I didn't invest my money as my employer directed. I cannot afford to buy bonds, but I can't afford to be fired even more.

* * * * *

Not only were we forced to buy bonds, but our superiors stood by the time clock with the blanks for the United Givers Fund, and refused to let us leave until we signed up. I am afraid to sign my name, but I am employed at * * *.

* * * * *

A representative of the 14th District Department of the American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge 421, reported:

The case of a GS-13 professional employee who has had the misfortune this past year of underwriting the expenses incurred by the last illness and death of both his mother and father just prior to this recent bond drive. This employee had been unofficially informed by his supervisor that he had been selected for a then existing GS-14 vacancy. When it became known that he was declining to increase his participation in the savings bond drive by increasing his payroll deduction for that purpose, he was informed that he might as well, in effect, kiss that grade 14 goodbye.

DISCLOSURE OF ASSETS, DEBTS, AND PROPERTY

Sections (i) and (j) meet a need for imposing a reasonable statutory limitation on the extent to which an employee must reveal the details of his or his family's personal finances, debts, or ownership of property.

The subcommittee believes that the conflict-of-interest statutes, and the many other laws governing conduct of employees, together with appropriate implementing regulations, are sufficient to protect the Government from dishonest employees. More zealous informational activities on the part of management were recommended by witnesses in lieu of the many questionnaires now required.

The employee criticism of such inquiries was summarized as follows:

There are ample laws on the statute books dealing with fraudulent employment, conflict of interest, etc. The invasion of privacy of the individual employee is serious enough, but the invasion of the privacy of family, relatives and children of the employee is an outrage against a free society.

This forced financial disclosure has caused serious moral problems and feelings by employees that the agencies distrust their integrity. We do not doubt that if every employee was required to file an absolutely honest financial disclosure, that a few, though insignificant number of conflict-of-interest cases may result. However, the discovery of the few legal infractions could in no way justify the damaging effects of forced disclosures of a private nature. Further, it is our opinion that those who are intent on engaging in activities which result in a conflict of interest would hardly supply that information on a questionnaire or financial statement. Many employees have indicated that rather than subject their families to any such unwarranted invasion of their right to privacy, that they are seriously considering other employment outside of Government.

The bill will reduce to reasonable proportions such inquiries as the following questionnaire, which many thousands of employees have periodically been required to submit.

(Questionnaire follows:)

28

CONFIDENTIAL STATEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND FINANCIAL INTERESTS (FOR USE BY REGULAR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES)			
NAME (Last, First, Initial)		TITLE OF POSITION	
DATE OF APPOINTMENT IN PRESENT POSITION		ORGANIZATION LOCATION (Operating agency, Bureau/Division)	
PART I. EMPLOYMENT AND FINANCIAL INTERESTS			
List the names of all corporations, companies, firms, or other business enterprises, partnerships, nonprofit organizations, and educational, or other institutions: (a) with which you are connected as an employee, officer, owner, director, member, trustee, partner, adviser, or consultant, or (b) in which you have any continuing financial interests, through a pension or retirement plan, shared income, or other arrangement as a result of any current or prior employment or business or professional association; or (c) in which you have any financial interest through the ownership of stock, stock options, bonds, securities, or other arrangements including trusts. If none, write NONE.			
NAME AND KIND OF ORGANIZATION (Use Part I designations where applicable)	ADDRESS	POSITION IN ORGANIZATION (Use Part I designations, if applicable)	NATURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST, e.g., STOCKS, PRIOR INCOME (Use Part I (b) & (c) designations if applicable)
PART II. CREDITORS			
List the names of your creditors other than those to whom you may be indebted by reason of a mortgage on property which you occupy as a personal residence or to whom you may be indebted for current and ordinary household and living expenses such as household furnishings, automobile, education, vacation, and similar expenses. If none, write NONE.			
NAME AND ADDRESS OF CREDITOR		CHARACTER OF INDEBTEDNESS, e.g., PERSONAL LOAN, NOTE, SECURITY	
PART III. INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY			
List your interest in real property or rights in lands, other than property which you occupy as a personal residence. If none, write NONE.			
NATURE OF INTEREST, e.g., OWNERSHIP, MORTGAGE, LIFE, INVESTMENT TRUST	TYPE OF PROPERTY, e.g., RESIDENCE, HOTEL, APARTMENT, UNDEVELOPED LAND	ADDRESS (If rural, give RFD & county and State)	
PART IV. INFORMATION REQUESTED OF OTHER PERSON			
If any information is to be supplied by other persons, such as trustee, attorney, accountant, relative, please indicate the name and address of such persons, the date upon which you requested that the information be supplied, and the nature of subject matter involved. If none, write NONE.			
NAME OF PERSON	DATE OF REQUEST	NATURE OF SUBJECT MATTER	
(THIS SPACE RESERVED FOR ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS.)			
I certify that the statements I have made are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.			
(Date)		(Signature)	

The vagueness of the standards for requiring such a broad surrender of privacy is illustrated by the Civil Service Commission's regulation applying this to any employee whose duties have an "economic impact on a non-Federal enterprise."

Also eliminated will be questionnaires asking employees to list "all assets, or everything you and your immediate family own, including date acquired and cost or fair market value at acquisition. (Cash in banks, cash anywhere else, due from others - loans, et cetera, automobiles, securities, real estate, cash surrender of life insurance; personal effects and household furnishings and other assets.)"

The view of the president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks reflected the testimony of many witnesses endorsing sections 1 (i) and (j) of the bill.

If the conflict-of-interest questionnaire is of doubtful value in preventing conflict of interest, as we believe, we can only conclude that it does not meet the test of essentiality and that it should be proscribed as an unwarranted invasion of employee privacy. Such value as it may have in focusing employee attention upon the problem of conflict of interest and bringing to light honest oversights that may lead to conflict of interest could surely be achieved by drawing attention to the 26 or more laws pertaining to conflict of interest or by more zealous information activities on the part of management.

The complex problem of preserving the confidential nature of such reports was described by officials of the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees:

The present abundance of financial questionnaires provides ample material for even more abusive personnel practices. It is almost inevitable that this confidential information cannot remain confidential. Typically, the financial questionnaire is filed with an employee's immediate supervisor. The net worth statements ultimately go into Inspection, but they pass through the hands of local personnel administrators. We have received a great number of disturbing reports—as have you—that this information about employees' private affairs is being used for improper purposes, such as enforced retirement and the like.

Inadequacies in agency procedures for obtaining such information from employees and for reviewing and storing it, are discussed in the Subcommittee report for the 89th Congress, 2d Session. Widely disparate attitudes and practices are also revealed in a Subcommittee study contained in the appendix of the printed hearings on S. 3779.

The bill will make such complaints as the following unnecessary in the future conduct of the Federal Government:

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: I am writing to applaud the stand you have taken on the new requirement that Federal employees in certain grades and categories disclose their financial holdings to their immediate superior. Having been a civil service employee for 26 years, and advanced from GS-4 to GS-15, and been cleared for top secret during World War II, and because I currently hold a position that involves the disposition of hundreds of thousands of the taxpayers' money, it is my conviction that my morality and trustworthiness are already a matter of record in the files of the Federal Government.

The requirement that my husband's financial assets be reported, as well as my own assets and those we hold jointly, was particularly offensive, since my husband is the head of our household and is not employed by Government.

You might also be interested in the fact that it required 6 hours of after-hours work on our part to hunt up all the information called for and prepare the report. Since the extent of our assets is our private

business, it was necessary that I type the material myself, an added chore since I am not a typist.

Our assets have been derived, in the main, from laying aside a portion of our earnings. At our ages (64 and 58) we would be far less deserving of respect had we not made the prudent provisions for our retirement which our assets and the income they earn represent. Yet this reporting requirement carries with it the implication that to have "clean hands" it would be best to have no assets or outside, unearned income when you work for the Federal Government.

For your information I am a GS-15, earning \$19,415. * * *

Thank you for speaking out for the continually maligned civil servant.

Sincerely yours,

_____, _____.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: I am a GS-12 career employee with over 15 years service.

The highest moral and ethical conduct has been my goal in each of my positions of employment and I have found this to be true of a vast majority of my fellow workers. It may be true a few people do put material gain ahead of their ethics but generally these people are in the higher echelons of office where their influence is much greater.

Our office has recently directed each employee from file clerk to the heads of sections to file a "Statement of Financial Interest." As our office has no programs individuals could have a financial interest in and especially no connections with FHA I feel it is no one's business but my own what real estate I own. I do not have a FHA mortgage or any other real property and have no outside employment, hence have nothing to hide by filing a blank form. Few Government workers can afford much real property. The principle of reporting to "Big Brother" in every phase of your private life to me is very degrading, highly unethical and very unquestionable as to its effectiveness. If I could and did use my position in some way to make a profit I would be stupid to report it on an agency inquiry form. What makes officials think reporting will do away with graft?

When the directive came out many man-hours of productive work were lost in discussions and griping. Daily since that date at some time during the day someone brings up the subject. The supervisors filed their reports as "good" examples but even they objected to this inquiry.

No single thing was ever asked of Government employees that caused such a decline in their morale. We desperately need a "bill of rights" to protect ourselves from any further invasion of our private lives.

Fifteen years ago I committed myself to Government service because: (a) I felt an obligation to the Government due to my education under the GI bill, (b) I could obtain freedom from pressures of unions, (c) I could obtain freedom from invasion of my private life, and (d) I would be given the opportunity to advance based solely on my professional ability and not on personal politics. At this point I certainly regret my decision to make the Government my career.

Sincerely,

_____, _____.

DEAR SENATOR: I write to beg your support of a "bill of rights" to protect Federal employees from official snooping which was introduced by Senator Ervin of North Carolina.

I am a veteran of two wars and have orders to a third war as a ready reservist. And I know why I serve in these wars: that is to prevent the forces of tyranny from invading America.

Now, as a Federal employee I must fill out a questionnaire giving details of my financial status. This is required if I am to continue working. I know that this information can be made available to every official in Washington, including those who want to regulate specific details of my life.

Now I am no longer a free American. For example, I can no longer buy stock of a foreign company because that country may be in disfavor with officials of the right or left. And I cannot "own part of America" by buying common stocks until an "approved list" is published by my superiors.

I can never borrow money because an agent may decide that debt makes me susceptible to bribery by agents of an enemy power. Nor do I dare own property lest some official may decide I should sell or rent to a person or group not of my choosing.

In short, I am no longer free to plan my own financial program for the future security of my family. In 1 day I was robbed of the freedom for which I fought two wars. This is a sickening feeling, you may be sure.

It seems plain that a deep, moral issue is involved here that concerns every citizen. If this thing is allowed to continue, tomorrow or next year every citizen may come under the inquisition. The dossier on every citizen will be on file for the use of any person or group having enough overt or covert power to gain access to them.

Sincerely,

On August 1966, Federal employees who were retired from the armed services were told to complete and return within 7 days, with their social security numbers, a 15-page questionnaire, asking, among other things:

How much did you earn in 1965 in wages, salary, commissions, or tips from all jobs?

How much did you earn in 1965 in profits or fees from working in your own business, professional practice, partnership, or farm?

How much did you receive in 1965 from social security, pensions (nonmilitary) rent (minus expenses), interests or dividends, unemployment insurance, welfare payments, or from any other source not already entered?

How much did other members of your family earn in 1965 in wages, salary, commissions or tips? (Before any deductions.) (For this question, a family consists of two or more persons in the same household who are related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption.) If the exact amount is not known, give your best estimate.

How much did other members of your family earn in 1965 in profits or fees from working in their own business, professional practices, partnership, or farm?

How much did any other member of your family receive in 1965 from social security, pensions, rent (minus expenses), interest or dividends, unemployment insurance, welfare payments; or from any other source not already entered?

RIGHT TO COUNSEL

Section 1(k) of the bill guarantees to Federal workers the opportunity of asking the presence of legal counsel, of a friend or other person when undergoing an official interrogation or investigation that could lead to the loss of their jobs or to disciplinary action.

The merits of this clause are manifold; not least of which is that uniformity and order it will bring to the present crazy quilt practices of the various agencies concerning the right to counsel for employees facing disciplinary investigations or possible loss of security clearances tantamount to loss of employment. The Civil Service Commission regulations are silent on this critical issue. In the absence of any Commission initiative or standard, therefore, the employing agencies are pursuing widely disparate practices. To judge from the questionnaires and other evidence before the subcommittee, a few agencies appear to afford a legitimate right to counsel, probably many more do not, and still others prescribe a "right" on paper but hedge it in such a fashion as to discourage its exercise. Some apparently do not set any regulatory standard, but handle the problem on an ad hoc basis.

On a matter as critical as this, such a pointless diversity of practice is poor policy. So far as job-protection rights are concerned, all Federal employees should be equal.

A second anomaly in the present state of affairs derives from recent developments in the law of the sixth amendment by the Supreme Court. In view of the decisions of *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 and *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478, it is clear that any person (including Federal employees) who is suspected of a crime is absolutely entitled to counsel before being subjected to custodial interrogation. Accordingly, some agencies, such as the Internal Revenue Service, acknowledge an unqualified right to counsel for an employee suspected of crime but decline to do the same for coworkers threatened with the loss of their livelihoods for noncriminal reasons. In the subcommittee's view, this discrimination in favor of the criminal suspect is both bad personnel policy as well as bad law. It would be corrected by this section of the bill.

The ultimate justification for the "right-to-counsel" clause, however, is the Constitution itself. There is no longer any serious doubt that Federal employees are entitled to due process of law as an incident of their employment relation. Once, of course, the courts felt otherwise, holding that absent explicit statutory limitation, the power of the executive to deal with employees was virtually unfettered.

The doctrinal underpinning of this rule was the 19th-century notion that the employment relation is not tangible "property." Both the rule and its underpinning have now been reexamined. The Supreme Court in recent years has emphasized the necessity of providing procedural due process where a man is deprived of his job or livelihood by governmental action.

While the courts have as yet had no occasion to articulate a specific right to counsel in the employment relationship, there can obviously be no doubt that the right to counsel is of such a fundamental character that it is among the essential ingredients of due process. What is at stake for an employee in a discharge proceeding—often including personal humiliation, obloquy and penury—is just as serious as that involved in a criminal trial. This is not to suggest that all the incidents of our civilized standard of a fair trial can or should be imported into Federal discharge proceedings. But if we are to have fair play for Federal employees, the right of counsel is a *sine qua non*. It is of a piece with the highest traditions, the fairest laws, and the soundest policy that this country has produced. And, in the judgment of this subcommittee, the clear affirmation of this basic right is very long overdue.

The need for such protection was confirmed at the hearings by all representatives of Government employee organizations and unions.

The president of the National Association of Letter Carriers testified:

It is a practice in the postal inspection service, when an employee is called in for questioning by the inspectors on a strictly postal matter that does not involve a felony, to deny the right of counsel. The inspectors interrogate the employee at length and, at the completion of the interrogation, one of the inspectors writes out a statement and pressures the employee to sign it before he leaves the room. We have frequently asked the postal inspection service to permit these employees to have counsel present at the time of the interrogation. The right for such counsel has been denied in all except a few cases. If the employee is charged with a felony, then, of course, the law takes over and the right for counsel is clearly established but in other investigations and interrogations no counsel is permitted.

Several agencies contend that right to counsel is now granted in formal adverse action proceedings and that appeals procedures make this section unnecessary for informal questioning. Testimony and complaints from employees indicate that this machinery does not effectively secure the opportunity of the employee to defend himself early enough in the investigation to allow a meaningful defense.

The predicament of postal employees as described at the hearings reflects the situation in other agencies as reported in many individual cases sent to the subcommittee. While it is undoubtedly true that in some simple questioning, counsel may not be necessary, in many matters where interrogation will result in disciplinary action, failure to have counsel at the first level reacts against the employee all the way up through the appeal and review. In the case of a postal employee, the subcommittee was told—

The first level is at the working foreman's level. He is the author of the charges; then the case proceeds to the postmaster, who appointed the foreman and, if the individual is found guilty of the charge at the first level, it is almost inevitable that this position will be supported on the second

level. The third level is the regional level, and the policy there is usually that of supporting the local postmaster. A disinterested party is never reached. The fourth level is the Appeals Board, composed of officials appointed by the Postmaster General. In some cases, the region will overrule the postmaster, but certainly the individual does not have what one could style an impartial appeals procedure.

Employees charged with no crime have been subjected to intensive interrogations by Defense Department investigators who ask intimate questions, make sweeping allegations, and threaten dire consequences unless consent is given to polygraph tests. Employees have been ordered to confess orally or to write and sign statements. Such interviews have been conducted after denial of the employee's request for presence of supervisor, counsel, or friend, and in several instances the interrogations have resulted in revocation of a security clearance, or denial of access to classified information by transfer or reassignment, with the resulting loss of promotion opportunities.

Witnesses testified that employees have no recourse against the consequences of formal charges based on information and statements acquired during a preliminary investigation. This renders meaningless the distinction urged by the Civil Service Commission between formal and informal proceedings.

EXCEPTIONS

The act under section 9, does not apply to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Furthermore, section 6 provides that nothing in the act will prohibit an official of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency from requesting any employee or applicant to take a polygraph test or a psychological test, or to provide a personal financial statement designed to elicit the personal information protected under subsections 1 (e), (f), (i), and (j). In such cases, the Director of the agency or his designee must make a personal finding with regard to each individual to be tested or examined that such test or information is required to protect the national security.

An exception to the right-to-counsel section has been provided to limit this right for employees in the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency to a person who serves in the same agency or a counsel cleared by the agency for access to the information involved. Obviously, it is expected that the employee's right to be accompanied by the person of his choice will not be denied unless that person's access to the information for the purpose of the case is clearly inconsistent with the national security. Other language recognizes problems unique to these two agencies. For instance, section 7 requires exhaustion of remedies by employees of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency and states that the act does not affect whatever existing statutory authority these agencies now possess to terminate employment. Section 8 is designed to assure that nothing in the act is construed to affect negatively any existing statutory or executive authority of the Directors of the Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Agency to protect their information in cases involving their employees. Consequently, procedures commended to the subcommittee by the Director of the Central Intelli-

gence Agency are spelled out for asserting that authority in certain proceedings arising under the act. Other committee amendments to S. 1035, as detailed earlier, were adopted to meet administrative requirements of the Federal security program and the intelligence community as well as the management needs of the executive branch.

ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement of the rights guaranteed in sections 1 and 2 of the bill is lodged in the administrative and civil remedies and sanctions of sections 3, 4, and 5. Crucial to enforcement of the act is the creation of an independent Board on Employee Rights to determine the need for disciplinary action against civilian and military offenders under the act and to provide relief from violations.

Testimony at the hearings as well as investigation of complaints have demonstrated that in the area of employee rights, a right is only as secure as its enforcement. There is overwhelming evidence that employees have heretofore frequently lacked appropriate remedies either in the courts or the Civil Service Commission for pursuing rights which belong to them as citizens.

Under the remedies afforded by sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill, an employee who believes his rights are violated under the act has several courses of action:

- (1) He may pursue a remedy through the agency procedures established to enforce the act, but the fact that he does not choose to avail himself of these does not preclude exercise of his right to seek other remedies.

- (2) He may register his complaint with the Board on Employee Rights and obtain a hearing. If he loses there, he may appeal to the district court, which has the power to examine the record as a whole and to affirm, modify, or set aside any determination or order, or to require the Board to take any action it was authorized to take under the act.

- (3) He may, instead of going directly to the Board, institute a civil action in Federal district court to prevent the threatened violation, or obtain complete redress against the consequences of the violation.

He does not need to exhaust any administrative remedies but if he elects to pursue his civil remedies in the court under section 4, he may not seek redress through the Board. Similarly, if he initiates action before the Board under section 5, he may not also seek relief from the court under section 4.

The bill does not affect any authority, right or privilege accorded under Executive Order 11491 governing employee-management cooperation in the Federal service. To the extent that there is any overlapping of subject matter, the bill simply provides an additional remedy.

THE BOARD ON EMPLOYEES' RIGHTS

As a result of hearings on S. 3779, the section creating a Board on Employees' Rights was added to the bill for introduction as S. 1035. Employees have complained that administrative grievance pro-

cedures have often proved ineffective because they are cumbersome, time-consuming, and weighted on the side of management. Not only do those who break the rules go unpunished many times, but the fearful tenor of letters and telephone calls from throughout the country indicate that employees fear reprisals for noncompliance with improper requests or for filing of complaints and grievances. Oral and written directives of warning to this effect have been verified by the subcommittee. Section 1 (e) of the bill, therefore, prevents reprisals for exercise of rights granted under the act and in such event accords the individual cause for complaint before the Board or the court.

Concerning the original bill in the 89th Congress, which did not provide for a board, representatives of the 14th department of the American Federation of Government Employees commented that the remedies are the most important aspects of such a bill because "unless due process procedures are explicitly provided, the remaining provisions of the bill may be easily ignored or circumvented by Federal personnel management. As a matter of fact, we believe, the reason employees' rights have been eroded so rapidly and so devastatingly in the last few years is the absence of efficient, expeditious, uniform, and legislatively well defined procedures of due process in the executive departments of the Federal Government."

An independent and nonpartisan Board is assured by congressional participation in its selection and by the fact that no member is to be a government employee. Provision is made for congressional monitoring through detailed reports.

Senator Ervin explained the function of the Board established by section 5 as follows:

The bill sets up a new independent Federal agency with authority to receive complaints and make rulings on complaints—complaints of individual employees or unions representing employees. This independent agency, which would not be subject in any way to the executive branch of the Government, would be authorized to make rulings on these matters in the first instance. It would make a ruling on action in a particular agency or department that is an alleged violation of the provisions of the bill, with authority either on the part of the agency or the part of the individual or on the part of the union to take an appeal from the ruling of this independent agency to the Federal court for judicial review.

Throughout its study the subcommittee found that a major area of concern is the tendency in the review process in the courts or agencies to do no more than examine the lawfulness of the action or decision about which the employee has complained. For purposes of enforcing the act, sections 3, 4 and 5 assure adequate machinery for processing complaints and for prompt and impartial determination of the fairness and constitutionality of general policies and practices initiated at the highest agency levels or by the Civil Service Commission or by Executive order.

Finding no effective recourse against administrative actions and policies which they believed unfair or in violation of their rights, individual employees and their families turned to Congress for redress. Opening the hearings on invasions of privacy, Senator Ervin stated:

Never in the history of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have we been so overwhelmed with personal complaints, phone calls, letters, telegrams, and office visits. In all of our investigations I have never seen anything to equal the outrage and indignation from Government employees, their families, and their friends. It is obvious that appropriate remedies are not to be found in the executive branch.

The complaints of privacy invasions have multiplied so rapidly of late that it is beyond the resources of Congress and its staff to repel effectively each individual official encroachment. Each new program brings a new wave of protest.

Prof. Alan Westin, director of the Science and Law Committee of the Bar Association of the city of New York, testified that these complaints "have been triggered by the fact that we do not yet have the kind of executive branch mechanism by which employees can lodge their sense of discomfort with personnel practices in the Federal Government and feel that they will get a fair hearing, that they will secure what could be called 'employment due process.'"

To meet this problem, Professor Westin proposed an independent board subject to judicial review, and with enforcement power over a broad statutory standard governing all invasion of privacy. Although it is continuing to study this proposal, the subcommittee has temporarily rejected this approach in the interest of achieving immediate enforcement of the act and providing administrative remedies for its violation. For this reason it supports the creation of a limited Board on Employees' Rights.

Perhaps one of the most important sections of the bill, if not the most important section, according to the United Federation of Postal Clerks, is the provision establishing the Board. The subcommittee was told—

It would appear absolutely essential that any final legislation enacted into law must necessarily include such a provision. We can offer no suggestion for improvement of this section. As presently constituted the section is easily understood; and the most excellent and inclusive definition of the proposed "Board on Employees' Rights" which could possibly be enacted into law. It defines the right of employees to challenge violations of the proposed act; defines the procedures involved, as well as the authority of the Board, penalties for violation of the act, as well as establishing the right of judicial review for an aggrieved party, and finally provides for congressional review, and in effect, an annual audit by the Congress of all complaints, decisions, orders, and other related information resulting from activities and operations of the proposed act.

Sanctions

The need for sanctions against offending officials has been evident throughout the subcommittee's investigation of flagrant disregard of basic rights and unpunished flaunting of administrative guidelines and prohibitions. It was for this reason that S. 3779 of the 89th Congress and S. 1035, as introduced, contained criminal penalties for offenders and afforded broad civil remedies and penalties.

Reporting on the experiences of the American Civil Liberties Union in such employee cases, Lawrence Speiser testified:

In filing complaints with agencies including the Civil Service Commission, the Army and the Navy, as I have during the period of time I have worked here in Washington, I have never been informed of any disciplinary action taken against any investigator for asking improper questions, for engaging in improper investigative techniques, for barring counsel when a person had a right to have counsel, or for a violation of any number of things that you have in this bill. Maybe some was taken, but I certainly couldn't get that information out of the agencies, after making the complaints. I would suggest that the bill also encompass provision for disciplinary action that would be taken against Federal employees who violate any of these rights that you have set out in the bill.

Other witnesses also pointed to the need for the disciplinary measures afforded by the powers of an independent Board to determine the need for corrective action and punishment, and felt they would be more effective than criminal penalties.

In view of the difficulty of filing criminal charges and obtaining prosecution and conviction of executive branch officials which might render the criminal enforcement provision meaningless for employees, the criminal penalties were deleted and a Board on Employee Rights incorporated into the scheme of remedies and sanctions in the bill.¹

Although the Civil Service Commission and the executive agencies have advocated placing such administrative remedies within the civil service grievance and appeals system, the subcommittee believes that the key to effective enforcement of the unique rights recognized by this act lies in the employee's recourse to an independent body.

"The theory of our Government," Professor Westin testified, "is that there should be somewhere within the executive branch where this kind of malpractice is corrected and that good administration ought to provide for control of supervision or other practices that are not proper. But the sheer size of the Federal Establishment, the ambiguity of the relationship of the Civil Service Commission to employees, and the many different interests that the Civil Service Commission has to bear in its role in the Federal Government, suggest that it is not an effective instrument for this kind of complaint procedure."

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

Section 1(a) makes it unlawful for a Federal official of any department or agency to require or request, or to attempt to require or request, any civilian employee of the United States serving in the department or agency or any person seeking employment to disclose his race, religion, or national origin, or the race, religion, or national origin of any of his forebears.

This section does not prohibit inquiry concerning citizenship of such individual if his citizenship is a statutory condition of his obtaining or

¹ In the 89th Congress, S. 1035.

retaining his employment. Nor does it preclude inquiry of the individual concerning his national origin or citizenship or that of his forebears when such inquiry is thought necessary or advisable in order to determine suitability for assignment to activities or undertakings related to national security within the United States or to activities or undertakings of any nature outside the United States.

This provision is directed at any practice which places the employee or applicant under compulsion to reveal such information as a condition of the employment relation. It is intended to implement the concept underlying the Federal merit system by which a person's race, religion, or national origin have no bearing on his right to be considered for Federal employment or on his right to retain a Federal position. This prohibition does not limit the existing authority or the executive branch to acquire such information by means other than self-disclosure.

Section 1(b) makes it unlawful for any officer of any executive department or executive agency of the U.S. Government, or for any person acting or purporting to act under this authority, to state, intimate, or to attempt to state or intimate, to any civilian employee of the United States serving in the department or agency that any notice will be taken of his attendance or lack of attendance at any assemblage, discussion, or lecture held or called by any officer of the executive branch of the U.S. Government, or by any person acting or purporting to act under his authority, or by any outside parties or organizations to advise, instruct, or indoctrinate any civilian employee of the United States serving in the department or agency in respect to any matter or subject other than (1) the performance of official duties to which he is or may be assigned in the department or agency, or (2) the development of skills, knowledge, or abilities which qualify him for the performance of such duties.

Nothing contained in this section is to be construed to prohibit taking notice of the participation of a civilian employee in the activities of any professional group or association.

This provision is designed to protect any employee from compulsion to attend meetings, discussions, and lectures on political, social, and economic subjects unrelated to his duties. It prevents Government officials from using the employment relationship to attempt to influence employee thoughts, attitudes, and actions on subjects which may be of concern to them as private citizens. In particular, this language is directed at practices and policies which in effect require attendance at such functions, including official lists of those attending or not attending; its purpose is to prohibit threat, direct or implied, written or oral, of official retaliation for nonattendance.

This section does not affect existing authority for providing information designed to promote the health and safety of employees. Nor does it affect existing authority to call meetings for the purpose of publicizing and giving notice to activities or service, sponsored by the department or agency, or campaigns such as charitable fund campaigns and savings bond drives.

Section 1(c) makes it unlawful for any officer of any executive department or agency, or for any person acting or purporting to act under his authority, to require or request or to attempt to require or

request any civilian employee serving in the department or agency to participate in any way in any activities or undertakings unless they are related to the performance of official duties to which he is or may be assigned in the department or agency or to the development of skills, knowledge, or abilities which qualify him for the performance of such duties.

This section is directed against official practices, requests, or orders that an employee take part in any civic function, political program, or community endeavor, or other activity which he might enjoy as a private citizen, but which is unrelated to his employment. It does not affect any existing authority to use appropriate techniques for publicizing existence of community programs such as blood-donation drives, or agency programs, benefits or services, and for affording opportunity for employee participation if he desires.

Section 1(d) makes it unlawful for any officer of any executive department or agency, or for any person acting under his authority to require or request or attempt to require or request, any civilian employee serving in the department or agency to make any report of his activities or undertakings unless they are related to the performance of official duties or to the development of skills, knowledge, or abilities which qualify him for the performance of such duties, or (2) unless there is reason to believe that the employee is engaged in outside activities or employment in conflict with his official duties.

This section is a minimum guarantee of the freedom of an employee to participate or not to participate in any endeavor or activity in his private life as a citizen, free of compulsion to report to supervisors his action or his inaction, his involvement or his noninvolvement. This section is to assure that in his private thoughts, actions, and activities he is free of intimidation or inhibition as a result of the employment relation.

The exceptions to the prohibition are not legislative mandates to require such information in those circumstances, but merely provide an area of executive discretion for reasonable management purposes and for observance and enforcement of existing laws governing employee conduct and conflicts of interest.

Section 1(e) makes it unlawful for any officer of any executive department or agency, or any person acting under his authority, to require or request any civilian employee serving in the department or agency, or any person applying for employment as a civilian employee to submit to any interrogation or examination or to take any psychological test designed to elicit from him any information concerning his personal relationship with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs or practices, or concerning his attitude or conduct with respect to sexual matters.

In accordance with an amendment made after hearings on S. 3779, a proviso is included to assure that nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a physician from eliciting such information or authorizing such test in the diagnosis or treatment of any civilian employee or applicant where he feels the information is necessary to enable him to determine whether or not the individual is suffering from mental illness. The bill as introduced limited this inquiry to psychiatrists, but an amendment extended it to physicians,

in respect to the performance of any of the official duties to which he is or may be assigned.

This section is designed to abolish and prohibit broad general inquiries which employees have likened to "fishing expeditions" and to confine any disclosure requirements imposed on an employee to reasonable inquiries about job-related financial interests. This does not preclude, therefore, questioning in individual cases where there is reason to believe the employee has a conflict of interest with his official duties.

Section 1(k) makes it unlawful for a Federal official of any department or agency to require or request, or attempt to require or request, a civilian employee who is under investigation for misconduct, to submit to interrogation which could lead to disciplinary action without the presence of counsel or other person of his choice, if he wishes.

This section is intended to rectify a longstanding denial of due process by which agency investigators and other officials prohibit or discourage presence of counsel or a friend. This provision is directed at any interrogation which could lead to loss of job, pay, security clearance, or denial of promotion rights.

This right insures to the employee at the inception of the investigation, and the section does not require that the employee be accused formally of any wrongdoing before he may request presence of counsel or friend. The section does not require the agency or department to furnish counsel.

A committee amendment to S. 782 adds a proviso that a civilian employee serving in the Central Intelligence Agency or the National Security Agency may be accompanied only by a person of his choice who serves in the agency in which the employee serves, or by counsel who has been approved by the agency for access to the information involved.

Section 1(l) makes it unlawful for a Federal official of any department or agency to discharge, discipline, demote, deny promotion, relocate, reassign, or otherwise impair existing terms or conditions of employment of any employee, or threaten to commit any such acts, because the employee has refused or failed to comply with any action made unlawful by this act or exercised any right granted by the act.

This section prohibits discrimination against any employee because he refuses to comply with an illegal order as defined by this act or takes advantage of a legal right embodied in the act.

SECTION 2

Section 2(a) makes it unlawful for any officer of the U.S. Civil Service Commission or any person acting or purporting to act under his authority to require or request, or attempt to require or request, any executive department or any executive agency of the U.S. Government, or any officer or employee serving in such department or agency, to violate any of the provisions of section 1 of this act.

Specifically, this section is intended to ensure that the Civil Service Commission, acting as the coordinating policymaking body in the area of Federal civilian employment shall be subject to the same strictures as the individual departments or agencies.

Section 2(b) makes it unlawful for any officer of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, or any person acting or purporting to act under his authority, to require or request, or attempt to require or request, any person seeking to establish civil service status or eligibility for civilian employment, or any person applying for employment, or any civilian employee of the United States serving in any department or agency, to submit to any interrogation or examination or to take any psychological test which is designed to elicit from him information concerning his personal relationship with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs or practices, or concerning his attitude or conduct with respect to sexual matters.

This section is intended to assure that the Civil Service Commission shall be subject to the same prohibitions to which departments and agencies are subject in sections 1 (e) and (f). The provisos contained in section 1(e) are restated here to assure that nothing in this section is to be construed to prohibit a physician from acquiring such data to determine mental illness, or an official from informing an individual of a specific charge of sexual misconduct and affording him an opportunity to refute the charge.

Section 2(c) makes it unlawful for any officer of the U.S. Civil Service Commission to require or request any person seeking to establish civil service status or eligibility for employment, or any person applying for employment in the executive branch of the U.S. Government, or any civilian employee serving in any department or agency to take any polygraph test designed to elicit from him information concerning his personal relationship with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs or practices, or concerning his attitude or conduct with respect to sexual matters.

This section applies the provisions of section 1(f) to the Civil Service Commission in instances where it has authority over agency personnel practices or in cases in which its officials request information from the applicant or employee.

SECTION 3

This section applies the act to military supervisors by making violations of the act also violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

SECTION 4

Section 4 provides civil remedies for violation of the act by granting an applicant or employee the right to bring a civil action in the Federal district court for a court order to halt the violation, or to obtain complete redress against the consequences of the violation. The action may be brought in his own behalf or in behalf of himself and others similarly situated, and the action may be filed against the offending officer or person in the Federal District court for the district in which the violation occurs or is threatened, or in the district in which the offending officer or person is found, or in the District Court for the District of Columbia.

The court hearing the case shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate the civil action without regard to the actuality or amount of pecuniary

injury done or threatened. Moreover, the suit may be maintained without regard to whether or not the aggrieved party has exhausted available administrative remedies. If the individual complainant has pursued his relief through administrative remedies established for enforcement of the act and has obtained complete protection against threatened violations or complete redress for violations, this relief may be pleaded in bar of the suit. The court is empowered to provide whatever broad equitable and legal relief it may deem necessary to afford full protection to the aggrieved party; such relief may include restraining orders, interlocutory injunctions, permanent injunctions, mandatory injunctions, or such other judgments or decrees as may be necessary under the circumstances.

Another provision of section 4 would permit an aggrieved person to give written consent to any employee organization to bring a civil action on his behalf, or to intervene in such action. "Employee organizations" as used in this section includes any brotherhood, council, federation, organization, union, or professional association made up in whole or in part of Federal civilian employees, and which deals with departments, agencies, commissions, and independent agencies regarding employee matters.

A committee amendment provides that the Attorney General shall defend officers or persons who acted pursuant to an order, regulation, or directive, or who, in his opinion, did not willfully violate the provisions of the act.

SECTION 5

Section 5 establishes an independent Board on Employees' Rights, to provide employees with an alternative means of obtaining administrative relief from violations of the act, short of recourse to the judicial system.

Section 5(a) provides for a Board composed of three members, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. No member shall be an employee of the U.S. Government and no more than two members may be of the same political party. The President shall designate one member as Chairman.

Section 5(b) defines the term of office for members of the Board, providing that one member of the initial Board shall serve for 5 years, one for 3 years, and one for 1 year from the date of enactment; any member appointed to fill a vacancy in one of these terms shall be appointed for the remainder of the term. Thereafter, each member shall be appointed for 5 years.

Section 5(c) establishes the compensation for Board members at \$75 for each day spent working in the work of the Board, plus actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from their usual places of residence.

Section 5(d) provides that two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Section 5(e) provides that the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of necessary employees, and make such expenditures necessary to carry out the functions of the Board.

Section 5(f) authorizes the Board to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out its functions.

Section 5(g) provides that the Board shall have the authority and duty to receive and investigate written complaints from or on behalf of any person claiming to be affected or aggrieved by any violation or threatened violation of this act, and to conduct a hearing on each such complaint. Moreover, within 10 days after the receipt of such a complaint, the Board must furnish notice of time, place, and nature of the hearing to all interested parties, and within 30 days after concluding the hearing, it must render its final decision regarding any complaint.

Section 5(h) provides that officers or representatives of any employee organization in any degree concerned with employment of the category in which the violation or threat occurs, shall be given an opportunity to participate in the hearing through submission of written data, views, or arguments. In the discretion of the Board they are to be afforded an opportunity for oral presentation. This section further provides that Government employees called upon by any party or by any Federal employee organization to participate in any phase of any administrative or judicial proceeding under this section shall be free to do so without incurring travel cost or loss in leave or pay. They shall be free from restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal in or because of their participation. Any periods of time spent by Government employees during such proceedings shall be held to be Federal employment for all purposes.

Section 5(i) applies to the Board hearings the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act relating to notice and conduct of hearings insofar as consistent with the purpose of this section.

Section 5(j) requires the Board, if it determines after a hearing that this act has not been violated, to state such determination and notify all interested parties of the findings. This determination shall constitute a final decision of the Board for purposes of judicial review.

Section 5(k) specifies the action to be taken by the Board if, after a hearing, it determines that any violation of this act has been committed or threatened. In such case, the Board shall immediately issue and cause to be served on the offending officer or employee an order requiring him to cease and desist from the unlawful practice or act. The Board is to endeavor to eliminate the unlawful act or practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

Within its discretion, the Board may, in the case of a first offense, issue an official reprimand against the offending officer or employee, or order the employee suspended from his position without pay for a period not exceeding 15 days. In the case of a second or subsequent offense, the Board may order the offending officer or employee suspended without pay for a period not exceeding 30 days, or may order his removal from office.

Officers appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, are specifically excluded from the application of these disciplinary measures; but the section provides that, in the case of a violation of this act by such individuals, the Board may transmit a report concerning such violation to the President and the Congress.

Section 5(l) provides for Board action when any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States or any person acting under his authority violates the act. In such event, the Board shall (1) submit a report to

the President, the Congress, and to the Secretary of the military department concerned, (2) endeavor to eliminate any unlawful act or practice through informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion, and (3) refer its determination and the record in the case to any person authorized to convene general courts-martial under section 822 (article 22) of title 10, United States Code. When this determination and report is received, the person designated shall immediately dispose of the matter under the provisions of chapter 47 of title 10 of the United States Code.

Section 5(m) provides that when any party disagrees with an order or final determination of the Board, he may institute a civil action for judicial review in the Federal district court for the district wherein the violation or threatened violation occurred, or in the District Court for the District of Columbia.

The court has jurisdiction to (1) affirm, modify, or set aside any determination or order made by the Board, or (2) require the Board to make any determination or order which it is authorized to make under section 5(k) but which it has refused to make. In considering the record as a whole, the court is to set aside any finding, conclusion, determination, or order of the Board unsupported by substantial evidence.

The type of review envisioned here is similar to that obtained under the Administrative Procedure Act in such cases but this section affords a somewhat enlarged scope for consideration of the case than is now generally accorded on appeal of employee cases. The court here has more discretion for action on its own initiative. To the extent that they are consistent with this section, the provisions for judicial review in title 5 of the United States Code would apply.

Section 5(n) provides for congressional review by directing the Board to submit to the Senate and to the House of Representatives an annual report which must include a statement concerning the nature of all complaints filed with it, the determinations and orders resulting from hearings, and the names of all officers or employees against whom any penalties have been imposed under this section.

Section 5(o) provides an appropriation of \$100,000 for the Board on Employee Rights.

SECTION 6

Section 6 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to prohibit an officer of the Central Intelligence Agency or of the National Security Agency, under specific conditions, from requesting an applicant or employee to submit a personal financial statement of the type defined in subsection 1 (i) and (j) or to take any polygraph or psychological test designed to elicit the personal information protected under subsection 1(e) or 1(f).

In these agencies, such information may be acquired from the employee or applicant by such methods only if the Director of the agency or his designee makes a personal finding with regard to each individual that such test or information is required to protect the national security.

SECTION 7

Section 7 requires, in effect, that employees of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency exhaust their admin-

istrative remedies before invoking the provisions of section 4 (the Board on Employee Rights) or section 5 (the Federal court action). An employee, his representative, or any organization acting in his behalf, must first submit a written complaint to the agency and afford it 120 days to prevent the threatened violation or to redress the actual violation. A proviso states that nothing in the act affects any existing legal authority of the Central Intelligence Agency under 50 U.S.C. 403(c) or of the National Security Agency under 50 U.S.C. 833 to terminate employment.

SECTION 8

Section 8 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to affect in any way authority of the directors of the Central Intelligence Agency or the National Security Agency to protect or withhold information pursuant to statute or Executive order. In cases involving his employees, the personal certification by the Director of the agency that disclosure of any information is inconsistent with the provision of any statute or Executive order is to be conclusive and no such information shall be admissible in evidence in any civil action under section 4 or in any proceeding or civil action under section 5. Nor may such information be receivable in the record of any interrogation of an employee under section 1(k).

SECTION 9

Section 9 provides that the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be excluded from the provisions of this act.

SECTION 10

Section 10 provides that nothing contained in sections 4 or 5 shall be construed to prevent the establishment of department and agency grievance procedures to enforce this act. The section makes it clear that the existence of such procedures are not to preclude any applicant or employee from pursuing any other available remedies. However, if under the procedures established by an agency, the complainant has obtained complete protection against threatened violations, or complete redress for violations, such relief may be pleaded in bar in the U.S. district court or in proceedings before the Board on Employees' Rights.

Furthermore, an employee may not seek his remedy through both the Board and the court. If he elects to pursue his remedies through the Board under section 5, for instance, he waives his right under section 4 to take his case directly to the district court.

SECTION 11

Section 11 is the standard severability clause.

